REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 10, and 11 are amended for informalities to more clearly recite the allowable subject matter. Claim 16 is added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants' representative thanks examiner Thomas Richardson and SPE William Vaughn for the telephone interview on April 24, 2008. New claim 16 was discussed during the interview. Examiner Richardson stated that new claim 16 was allowable over the prior art of record but another search was required for a final determination of claim allowability. Examiner Richardson requested that the amendment be submitted with support for the new features being pointed out in the specification. Examiner Richardson said that he would call applicants' representative if claim 16 was determined to be allowable to discuss actions to expedite prosecution of the application.

I. New Claim 16

The following is new claim 16 annotations to show support for the different features as requested by the examiner. These features are only examples of some places in which the claimed features may be found and not intended to be exhaustive to imply features from the examples. No new matter has been added.

> 16. A method for accessing a first application **(Fig. 1, #26)** by a first server **(Fig. 1, #14)** and then replacing said first application with a second application **(Fig. 1, #46)** executing in a second server **(Fig. 1, #40)**, said first server having a first, local storage **(Fig. 1, #27)**, said second server having a second, local storage **(Fig. 1, #49)**, said method comprising the steps of:
>
> routing a request for an application identified by a first level name and a second level name from a proxy server **(Fig. 1, #14) (page 8, lines 20-27)** to said first server **(Fig. 1, #46)**, said first server requesting from said first local storage **(Fig. 1, #27)** said application identified by said first level name and said second level name, said request being redirected from a first local storage to said first application in a shared storage **(Fig. 1, #50)**, said first application in said shared storage having said first level name, said second level name and a third level name **(page 9, line 1-5)**, wherein said first level name, said second level name and said third level name of said first application represent qualifiers that form a

first hierarchical directory in said shared storage **(page 8, lines 1-15)**, wherein a first level qualifier of said first application indicates a name of said first application, a second level qualifier of said first application indicates an address of said first application **(page 9, lines 3-7)**, and a third level qualifier of said first application indicates a version number of said first application **(page 9, lines 7-14)**;

accessing, by a third server **(Fig. 1, #114; page 11, lines 1-3)**, said first application from said shared storage, said first application identified by a second, extended hierarchical directory **(page 5, lines 4-6)** comprising said first level hierarchy plus a lower level qualifier;

subsequently routing a request for said application identified by said first level name and said second level name to a second server **(page 10, lines 21-30)**; **(page 11, lines 8-15)**, wherein the second server is a test server **(Fig. 1, #40)**, said second server requesting from said second local storage **(Fig. 1, #40)**, said application identified by said first level name and said second level name, said request being redirected from said second local storage to a second application in said shared storage **(Fig. 1, #47)** , said second application in said shared storage having said first level qualifier of said first application, said second level qualifier of said first application, and a third level name different than said third level name of said first application in said shared storage **(page 10, lines 1-12)**, wherein said first level name, said second level name and said third level name of said second application represent qualifiers that form said second, extended hierarchical directory in said shared storage **(page 5, lines 2-6)**, wherein the different third level name is a third level qualifier of said second application that indicates a different version number, the different version number identifying said second application as a more recent version of said first application **(page 5, lines 13-14)**;

configuring a test proxy server **(Fig. 1, #114; page 13, lines 1-3)** to route requests to said test server by adding a proxy statement to the test proxy server (**page 13, lines 3-5**);

verifying a proper operation of said application on said test server **(Fig. 1, #40; page 12, lines 21-26; Fig. 2B, #257)**;

responsive to verifying a proper operation of said application, permanently reconfiguring said proxy server to route all subsequent requests for

said application identified by said first level name and said second level name to said test server instead of said first server **(page 13, lines 10-13)**, wherein permanently reconfiguring said proxy server comprises adding said proxy statement to said proxy server **(page 13, lines 13-18**; and

terminating the test proxy server by removing the proxy statement **(Fig. 2B. #276; page 13, lines 19-20)**.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ossiansson et al. (International Patent Application No. WO 03/005192), ("*Ossiansson*") in combination with Holcomb (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,795), ("*Holcomb*"). The rejections are respectfully traversed. The claimed inventions recited in these claims are not obvious over *Ossiansson* or *Holcomb*, either alone or in combination. Neither *Ossiansson* nor *Holcomb*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest recited claim features in these calims. Therefore, the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as will be described below.

In rejecting claim 1, the examiner points to the following section of *Ossiansson*:

> As per claim 1, Ossiansson teaches a method for accessing a first application by a first server and then replacing said first application with a second application executing in a second server, said first server having a first, local storage, said second server having a second, local storage (page 2, lines 16-25), said method comprising the steps of:
>
> routing a request for an application to said first server, said first server requesting from said first local storage said application, said request being redirected from said first local storage to said first application in a shared storage, wherein the file name of said first application forms a hierarchical directory in said shared storage (page 3, lines 5-15), where the first server can access the operating system (OSI) in the shared storage means, also page 4, lines 13-21, where the version of the program is applicable to OS1); and
>
> subsequently routing a request for said application to a second server, said second server requesting from said second local storage, said request being redirected from said second local storage to said second application in said shared storage, said second application in said shared storage having a name different than said name of said first application in said shared storage, wherein said name of said second application forms a hierarchical directory in said shared storage (page 3, lines 5-15, where the second server can access the other operating system (OS2) in the shared storage means, also page 4, lines 13-21, where another version of the application is applicable to OS2). *Office Action dated March 13, 2008, pages 3-4, paragraph 4.*

The examiner then combines the secondary reference of *Holcomb* asserting:

> Ossiansson does not teach a file system to implement, but Holcomb discloses a method for creating a virtual file system, wherein the system forms a hierarchic data structure: said first application in said shared storage having said first level name, said second level name and a third level name, wherein said first level name, said second level name and said third level name of said first application form a hierarchical directory in

said shared storage (Figure 1 and accompanying description, where the files F85-F88 are shown at the bottom of a hierarchical data structure given by a multi-tiered directory); and said second application in said shared storage having said first level name, said second level name and a third level name different than said third level name of said first application in said shared storage, wherein said first level name, said second level name and said third level name of said second application form a hierarchical directory in said shared storage (Figure 1 and accompanying description, where the files F85-F88 are shown at the bottom of a hierarchical data structure given by a multi-tiered directory. The differing files, e.g. F85 and F86, show that two files may contain the same high-level names, with the difference in name only on the level of the actual file). *Office Action dated March 13, 2008, page 4, paragraph 4.*

The examiner states the following as a rationale to combine *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb*:

> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Holcomb's file naming system in Ossiansson's operating system server. Holcomb states that the system allows for large storage while using little memory (Column 1, lines 16-20). This would be beneficial in Ossiansson's system, as it would allow the server to store more information in an easily accessible manner.). *Office Action dated March 13, 2008, page 4-5, paragraph 4.*

A. The examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness

The examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the prior art when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The examiner has failed to meet this burden in the present case. In this particular case, the cited references do not teach the features as believed by the examiner. Further, the modifications and combinations proposed by the examiner would not be made when the references are considered as a whole by one of ordinary skill in the art. These and other reasons are discussed below in more detail.

B. All claim limitations must be considered, especially when missing from prior art

It is well-settled that "obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim." *Royka*, 490 F.2d 981,985, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Thus, the different claim features in the presently claimed invention may not be ignored in an obviousness determination. The present claim in amended claim 1 recites:

> 1. A method for accessing a first application by a first server and then replacing said first application with a second application executing in a second server, said first server having a first, local storage, said second server having a second, local storage, said method comprising the steps of:
>
> routing a request for an application identified by a first level name and a second level name from a proxy server to said first server, said first server

requesting from said first local storage said application identified by said first level name and said second level name, said request being redirected from said first local storage to said first application in a shared storage, said first application in said shared storage having said first level name, said second level name and a third level name, wherein said first level name, said second level name and said third level name of said first application form a hierarchical directory in said shared storage; and

subsequently routing a request for said application identified by said first level name and said second level name to a second server, said second server requesting from said second local storage, said application identified by said first level name and said second level name, said request being redirected from said second local storage to said second application in said shared storage, said second application in said shared storage having said first level name, said second level name and a third level name different than said third level name of said first application in said shared storage, wherein said first level name, said second level name and said third level name of said second application form a hierarchical directory in said shared storage.

Ossiansson fails to teach all the recited limitations in the claims. For example, claim 1 states that a proxy server is a feature. *Ossiansson* does not teach or suggest the use of a proxy server. Consequently, *Ossiansson* does not teach or suggest the feature of "routing a request for an application . . .from a *proxy server* to said first server."

The examiner provides cites to two sections of *Ossiansson,* page 3, lines 5-15 and page 4, lines 13-21, as teaching the features of claim 1.

Ossiansson, page 3, lines 5-15 discloses:

> The object is also achieved according to the invention by a method for use in a computer network for providing at least one service to at least one client computer, said client computer using a first operating system, said arrangement comprising at least a first (S1) server and a second server (S2) accessible by the client computer, each one of said servers being connectable to a first memory location (C:\), each one of said first and second server being connectable to storage means comprising at least a first (OS1) and a second (OS2) preconfigured operating system stored in such a way that it can be retrieved by the at least one server, but cannot be alterable by an unauthorized user, monitoring the function of the at least first and second server, determining if said first server needs to be rebooted, if the first server needs to be rebooted, selecting an operating system with which to reboot the first server. *Ossiansson*, page 3, lines 5-15.

Ossiansson, page 4, lines 13-21 discloses:

> Preferably the arrangement further comprises storage means comprising at least a first and a second version of a first application, said first version being adapted to the first operating system (OS1) and said second version being adapted to the second operating system (OS2), control means for selecting the version of said application adapted to the selected preconfigured operating system to be downloaded to the first server, said application being control means for downloading and installing the at least one application to the first memory location of the first server. *Ossiansson*, page 4, lines 13-21.

Nowhere in the cited sections of *Ossiansson*, or anywhere else in *Ossiansson* for that matter, does there exist a suggestion or teaching of a proxy server, as recited in claim 1.

In fact, the text of the Office Action paraphrases claim language in claim 1 to completely exclude the term "proxy server" and provides no mapping to the prior art for the limitation of "proxy server". For example, the rejection states "routing a request for an application to said first server." This part of the examiner's rejection does not include or consider "routing a request for an application ... from a proxy server to said first server."

Ossiansson discloses a load balance unit (LBU). *Ossiansson's* load balance unit "directs the users to the appropriate server meeting the need of each user." *Ossiansson*, page 11, lines 26-27. *Ossiansson* further discloses that the load balance unit directs a user to a particular server offering a desired service, i.e. application, with the appropriate operating system. In sum, the LBU of *Ossiansson* routes application requests to various servers. The function of a load balance unit is well known in the art and one of ordinary skill would readily acknowledge that not only is the LBU *not* a server, it certainly cannot be considered to be similar to a proxy server. *Holcomb* does nothing to cure the deficiency of *Ossiansson* and does not suggest or disclose of a proxy server as recited in claim 1.

"All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). The Office Action, at least, fails to consider feature of a "proxy server". Further, neither *Ossiansson* nor *Holcomb*, alone or in combination teach or suggest the feature of a proxy server. Accordingly, the Office Action cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and for at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 by the combination of *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb* has been over come.

Claim 1 additionally requires that the request for an application, routed from the proxy server to a first server and used to access the local storage of the first server, be redirected from the first server's local storage to access a first application in a shared storage. Specifically, claim 1 recites *said request being redirected from said first local storage to a first application in a shared storage.* Nowhere in *Ossiansson* does there exist a suggestion or teaching of redirecting a request for an application from the local storage of a first server to another application in a shared storage. The Office Action fails to specifically map this feature and cites generally to *Ossiansson* , page 3, lines 5-15 and *Ossiansson*, page 4, lines 13-21. *Ossiansson*, page 3, lines 5-15 states:

> The object is also achieved according to the invention by a method for use in a computer network for providing at least one service to at least one client computer, said client computer using a first operating system, said arrangement comprising at least a first (S1) server and a second server (S2) accessible by the client computer, each one of said servers being connectable to a first memory location (C:\), each one of said first and second server being connectable to storage means comprising at least a first (OS1) and a second (OS2) preconfigured operating system stored in such a way that it can be retrieved

> by the at least one server, but cannot be alterable by an unauthorized user, monitoring the function of the at least first and second server, determining if said first server needs to be rebooted, if the first server needs to be rebooted, selecting an operating system with which to reboot the first server. *Ossiansson*, page 3, lines 5-15.

Ossiansson, page 4, lines 13-21 states:

> Preferably the arrangement further comprises storage means comprising at least a first and a second version of a first application, said first version being adapted to the first operating system (OS1) and said second version being adapted to the second operating system (OS2), control means for selecting the version of said application adapted to the selected preconfigured operating system to be downloaded to the first server, said application being control means for downloading and installing the at least one application to the first memory location of the first server. *Ossiansson*, page 4, lines 13-21.

However, nothing in *Ossiansson*, page 3, lines 5-15, *Ossiansson*, page 4, lines 13-21, or anywhere in *Ossiansson* teaches or suggests the feature of a *request being redirected from said first local storage to a first application in a shared storage*. The term *redirected*, when regarded as a whole by one of ordinary skill in the art, requires the existence of an initial request from a proxy server to a first server and then redirecting that same initial request to a shared storage.

Ossiansson simply does not teach routing a request for an application from a proxy server to a first server, *then redirecting that same request for an application in a local storage of the first server to an application in a shared storage*. *Holcomb* does nothing to cure the deficiency of *Ossiansson* and does also not suggest or disclose the feature of "said request being redirected from said first local storage to a first application in a shared storage".

Thus, neither *Ossiansson* nor *Holcomb*, alone or in combination teach or suggest the feature of a request being redirected from said first local storage to a first application in a shared storage. Accordingly, the a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be made, and for at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 by the combination of *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb* has been overcome.

Claim 1 further requires routing the request previously routed to the first server to a second server and then redirecting that same request from the local storage of the second server to the same shared storage. Specifically, claim 1 recites "subsequently routing a request for said application . . . *to a second server, said second server requesting from said second local storage*, said application . . ., said request being redirected from said second local storage to said second application in said shared storage."

Previously cited passages of *Ossiansson*, i.e., *Ossiansson* , page 3, lines 5-15 and *Ossiansson*, page 4, lines 13-21, reproduced *supra*, have been used to reject claim 1. However, nothing in *Ossiansson*, page 3, lines 5-15, *Ossiansson*, page 4, lines 13-21, or anywhere in *Ossiansson* teaches or suggests Applicant's feature of a *request being redirected from said second local storage to a second application in a shared storage*. Furthermore, *Holcomb* does nothing to cure the deficiency of

Ossiansson and also does not suggest or disclose the feature "said request being redirected from said second local storage to a second application in a shared storage".

"The question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not whether the differences [between the claimed invention and the prior art] would have been obvious" but "whether the claimed invention *as a whole* would have been obvious." *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 1537, 218 USPQ 871, 877 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (emphasis in original). While it may be arguable that *Ossiansson* in combination with *Holcomb* discloses and/or suggests first and second servers, shared storage, and a hierarchical directory structure in a shared storage, neither *Ossiansson* nor *Holcomb* alone or in combination teaches or suggests Applicants' claimed invention *as a whole*.

Accordingly, the a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be made, and for at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 by the combination of *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb* under 35 USC 103(a) shas been overcome.

C. The Combination of *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb* Is Erroneous

"Rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.'" *KSR Int'l*, 550 U.S. ____, ____, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007) quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006). If a proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The examiner's reasoning for combining the prior arts of *Ossiansson and Holcomb* cannot be used in this case. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art "to employ *Holcomb's* file system in *Ossiansson's* operating system server." Even assuming, *arguendo*, that *Ossiansson* taught or suggested claim features in claim 1, a combination of the *Holcomb* file system with *Ossiansson* would not render claim 1 obvious as believed by the examiner.

Holcomb discloses a file system that uses a *fixed or absolute pathing*. *Holcomb's* general description of the file system states:

> As is best understood with reference to the exemplary defined file structure of FIG. 1, the virtual filesystem of the present invention has a predefined and fixed directory hierarchy which begins at a root directory "\". Below the root directory is a set of 1st level directories which are subdirectories to the root directory The directory fanout N and hierarchy depth Y can be advantageously chosen to provide a virtual filesystem having a desired number of files. The number of files is calculated according to the formula N^Y. *Holcomb*, column 3, lines 42-46; column 4, lines 3-6.

The organization of the directory pathways of Holcomb, i.e. the number of pathways and their relationships, are pre-determined and remain fixed for a particular system. The root directory is fixed and so is the directory hierarchy.

By contrast, claim 1 recites the use of a hierarchical directory in a shared storage, which is not the same as the file system in Holcomb. which has a fixed files structure. Additionally, the fixed file structure of *Holcomb* cannot support redirecting a request from a local storage to a shared storage as recited in claim 1. Without support for at least these features, the combination of *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb* fails. Therefore, a *prima facie* obvious over the combination of *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb* cannot be made.

Independent claims 5, 10, and 11 recite similar features as claim 1 and the same arguments used to traverse the rejection of claim 1, *supra*, are applicable to traverse the rejection of claims 5, 10, and 11. For at least the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness against claims 5, 10, and 11. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should also be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1. Dependent claims 6-9 and 12-15 depend from claims 5 and 11, respectively. "Dependent claims are non-obvious if the independent claims from which they depend are nonobvious." *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1785 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 2-4, claims 6-9 and 12-15 under 35 USC 103(a) should also be withdrawn.

Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner rejects claims 3, 7, 9 (*sic*) and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb*, as applied to claims 1, 5, and 11 above, and further in view of Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,852), "*Ferguson*". This rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither *Ossiansson, Holcomb*, nor *Ferguson*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recited claim features. Therefore, the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 has been rejected as follows:

> As per claim 3, the combination of Ossiansson and Holcomb teaches a method as set forth in claim 1.
>
> The combination does not teach rerouting an application request. Ferguson teaches an application update system where there is a proxy server which routed said request for said application identified by said first level name and said second level name to said first server, and further comprising the step of reconfiguring said proxy server to

> route subsequent requests for said application identified by said first level name and said second level name to said second server instead of said first server (Figure 1 and accompanying descriptions show that in the prior art, an application server may be removed from the system to be upgraded, meanwhile the requests are sent to another server.)
>
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use Ferguson's disclosed method of rerouting server requests in the system of Ossiansson. The system would benefit, as it would allow traffic to be immediately routed to another server if the application is upgraded. After a file has been modified, the older version is no longer used, so it would be unnecessary to route requests to it. The changing of routing allows the hosts to have continuous access, which improves server availability and system capacity, which is beneficial and often essential (Ferguson, Column 1, lines 27-31. In addition, the inclusion of Holcomb's file naming system would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Holcomb states that the system allows for large storage while using little memory (Column 1, lines 16-20). *Office Action* dated March 13, 2008, pages 12-13.

The Office Action Fails to Establish a Prima Facie Case Of Obviousness Using *Ferguson*, *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb*

Claim 3 recites:

> A method as set forth in claim 1 wherein there is a proxy server which routed said request for said application identified by said first level name and said second level name to said first server, and further comprising the step of reconfiguring said proxy server to route subsequent requests for said application identified by said first level name and said second level name to said second server instead of said first server.

Claim 3 includes a feature in which a proxy server is reconfigured to route all subsequent request for an application to another or second server. *Ferguson* does not teach or suggest this recited claim feature of reconfiguring said proxy server to route subsequent requests to a second server in claim 3. *Ferguson* teaches upgrading software for an application on one or multiple servers. When an application on a server is designated for an upgrade, *Ferguson* temporarily holds any requests for the application until the upgrade of the application is completed. *Ferguson* discloses:

> A method for upgrading one of several computer programs stored on an application server in a distributed computing environment while permitting the application server to continue to service requests for other computer programs. In accordance with the method, the application server is prevented from receiving any new requests for the computer program. The system then waits until all current requests serviced by the application server for that computer program have ended. Then, after acknowledging completion of upgrading of the computer program, the application server is permitted to receive any new requests for the computer program. Ferguson, Abstract. (emphasis added)

Ferguson does not reroute any requests. *Ferguson* causes the temporary cessation of any requests for an application that is being upgraded on an application server by temporarily reconfiguring a management server or router. In *Ferguson*:

> The system management server then forbids the router to route client requests to Application Server 1. . .thereby removing Application Server 1 from active service during the upgrade procedure. For example, the system management server may send a signal to the router with an appropriate message to cause the router to stop sending new requests which could be service by the application server being upgraded. This may require addition, deletion or modification to the server List stored at the router and/or management server.
>
> Once the upgrade is complete, the system management server then permits the router to route new client requests to the Application Server. In effect, the application server is added back to the distributed computing system. Ferguson, column 2, lines 53-62, column 3, lines 17-26. (emphasis added)

Consequently, *Ferguson* does not perform a reconfiguration to reroute subsequent requests to another server. Ferguson simply stops sending requests to the server temporarily until after an upgrade is complete.

Neither *Holcomb* nor *Ossiansson* cure the deficiency of *Ferguson*. *Holcomb* and *Ossiansson*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest feature in claim 3 for reconfiguring said proxy server to route subsequent requests to a second server. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 3 using *Ferguson*, *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb*, and for at least this reason, cannot be made and the rejection of claim 3 has been overome.

Dependent claims 7 and 13 include similar features to claim 3 and therefore these claims also are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 7 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) should also be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over *Ossiansson* and *Holcomb*, either alone or in combination, and is now in condition for allowance, a notice of which is earnestly solicited.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: April 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Duke W. Yee/
Duke W. Yee
Reg. No. 34,285
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicant